

R E M A R K S

The Examiner rejects claims 24-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Revel in view of Snyders.

Claim 24 distinguishes at least by reciting not storing the decrypted sensitive data in a readable decrypted form after the decrypting but before printing of the data, but rather storing the decrypted sensitive data in a non-volatile memory such that the decrypted sensitive data are distributed in a plurality of memory segments of the non-volatile memory where a relationship of the memory segments of the non-volatile memory is stored as relationship data independently of the stored decrypted sensitive data. For this claim language, the Examiner cites paragraphs 15, 21, and 25 of the primary reference Revel.

Paragraph 15 only discloses using an encryption key at the mobile printer to decrypt but does not disclose storing of the decrypted data at all. Paragraph 21 discusses presence of a non-volatile memory as shown in Fig. 1 but there is no discussion of this non-volatile memory storing any decrypted data and does not disclose any suggestion of storing the decrypted data in memory segments and storing relationship data independently of the stored decrypted sensitive data. Figure 1 in paragraph 12 of Revel only provides general information about software which is stored in the memory 116, namely the operating system, encryption logic, etc. Nothing is mentioned about storing decrypted print data just before printing.

Finally, paragraph 25 discusses various types of computer-readable media but nowhere discloses any storing of the encrypted data in a memory, and particularly there is no disclosure of memory segments and a relationship data stored independently.

If the Examiner believes that these three paragraphs have the recited claim language, Applicants would appreciate the opportunity to discuss in a telephone interview why Applicants cannot find the claim language in the referenced paragraphs. The Office Action does not contain an explanation as to how these paragraphs disclose the claim language.

The secondary reference of Snyders was only cited for converting decrypted sensitive data to be printed into control signals, but this does not satisfy the deficiencies noted above for the primary reference Revel.

Dependent claims 25-40 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 24 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Independent system claim 41 and independent method claim 50 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 24 and are allowable for those reasons.

Dependent claims 42-49 dependent on claim 41 are allowable at least for the reasons noted with respect to system claim 41 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,



Brett A. Valiquet (Reg. No. 27,841)
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
Patent Department - **CUSTOMER NO. 26574**
6600 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicant